

Application Number: 10/736,100

**Amendments to Claims:**

This listing of claims will replace all prior versions of claims in the application:

1. (Currently amended) A process to give a true indication of respondent satisfaction to an electronic questionnaire survey of a subject matter which is affected by human satisfaction, including the steps of:

asking the respondent or a plurality of respondents to give their answers to two sets of questions (a first set and a second set) on a computer;

basing the said two sets of questions on similar statements, but posed differently, so that said first ~~said~~ set of questions are answered emotionally by said respondent or a plurality of respondents and said second ~~said~~ set of questions are answered rationally;

the survey initiator ranking the said statements used in both said sets of questions; dynamically generating the said second set of questions at the time of said questionnaire survey, based upon the answers to the said first set of questions;

ranking the responses to both said sets of questions programmatically using said computer;

comparing said rankings from both said sets of questions programmatically using said computer;

recording computer calculated values for satisfaction and level of conviction within the memory of said computer's memory computer based on said comparison;

presenting the said calculated values for satisfaction and level of conviction (the weighted score) to said respondent at the time of said survey on said computer's output device.

Application Number: 10/736,100

2. (Previously submitted) The process according to claim 1 of subdividing said subject matter of said questionnaire survey into a number of ranked groups in which the number of said statements is calculated and equally distributed in number amongst said groups and are ranked within each said group according to the importance of the statement to the survey initiator.
3. (Previously submitted) The process according to claim 1 of defining two sets of said similar statements in which both sets of statements contain sentences with the same meaning, but using different words so that the first said set can be used in a set of questions designed to be responded to emotionally on said computer and the second said set can be combined to answer the questions rationally on said computer.
4. (Cancelled)
5. (Currently amended) The process according to claim 1 of defining a said second set of questions programmatically on said computer in which said second set of questions are dynamically created by grouping together a number of statements from said second set of statements at the time of questionnaire on said computer based on the responses to said first set of questions.
6. (Cancelled)
7. (Previously submitted) The process according to claim 5 in which said second set of questions are defined so that the respondent is forced to respond rationally to said group of statements on said computer.
8. (Previously submitted) The process according to claim 1 of scoring and ranking said responses to said first set of questions programmatically on said computer in which said respondent's emotional response has a value calculated programmatically on said computer, which represents the level of conviction (also known as the "weighting") of said respondent's emotional responses to said questions and then ranked programmatically on said computer.

Application Number: 10/736,100

9. (Previously submitted) The process according to claim 1 of scoring and ranking said responses to said second set of questions programmatically on said computer in which said respondent's rational response has a value calculated programmatically on said computer, which represents the level of conviction (also known as the "weighting") of said respondent's rational responses to said questions and then ranked programmatically on said computer.

10. (Currently amended) The process according to claim 1 of comparing said emotional and rational responses from said respondent or a plurality of respondents programmatically on said computer in which the closeness of match of said emotional and rational responses is quantifiably measured on said computer, thereby giving a value for respondent or a plurality of respondents' satisfaction.

11. (Cancelled)

12. (Cancelled)

13. (Currently amended) A process including the steps of:

~~storing responses from said a respondent to said first part of a said~~ presenting a questionnaire survey intended to measure human satisfaction from to a respondent on the display of an input device in a computer system; which can be either a standalone system or part of a local area network (LAN) or wide area network (WAN);

storing responses from said respondent to said survey in said computer system  
processing said responses in a central processing unit in said computer system;  
dynamically arranging said ~~second a~~ set of statements based on the ~~results to the said~~  
first part, for said second part of the questionnaire said responses, in order to  
generate a second set of questions;

presenting said second set of questions on said display device to said respondent for completion;

Application Number: 10/736,100

registering and processing said respondent's resulting input on said input device in said processing unit;

storing said inputs in a storage device;

outputting a summary of said respondent's results to said respondent in both a textual and graphical format on said display device, should it be so desired.

14. (Cancelled)

15. (Currently amended) The process according to claim 13 of giving said respondent immediate feedback to a questionnaire survey intended to measure human satisfaction in which a textual and/or graphical summary of their input is can be shown immediately on said display device following their completion of the electronic questionnaire survey.

16. (Cancelled)

17. (Cancelled)

18. (Cancelled)

19. (Currently amended) A process including the steps of:

~~capturing and summarising inputs from~~ presenting a questionnaire survey intended to record human satisfaction ~~from to a respondent or a plurality of respondents using~~ on the display of a computer on a standalone system or a local area network (LAN) or a wide area network (WAN);

capturing inputs from said plurality of respondents on the input device of said computer and summarising said inputs;

displaying the results said summary on either said display or another display device which is part of the said local area network (LAN) or a wide area network (WAN) so that each questionnaire survey originator is able to see results said summary not only for their own entity, but also for a plurality of entities, typically in the same industry (consisting of like-minded survey originators, who have conducted the same questionnaire survey for their own entities);

Application Number: 10/736,100

performing industry wide benchmarking, ~~which, because of the repeatability of the present invention, now becomes possible, for these surveys intended to record for~~  
human satisfaction where such a feature would be beneficial.

20. (Currently amended) The process according to claim 19 of ~~assigning~~ calculating  
numerical values to for said respondents emotional responses which allow a simple summary  
of emotional responses from a plurality of respondents by using simple addition on a  
computer.

21. (Currently amended) The process according to claim 19 of ~~assigning~~ calculating  
numerical values to for said respondents rational responses which allow a simple summary of  
rational responses from a plurality of respondents by using simple addition on a computer.

22. (Currently amended) The process according to claim 19 of adding said values results of  
the emotional responses of ~~all~~ said respondents in the survey originator's entity as well as  
their rational responses on a said computer and comparing the two results, ~~so that values can  
be mathematically assigned to in order to calculate a numerical value on the said computer for~~  
both the entity's satisfaction and level of conviction (the weighted score) which are  
representative for the whole entity and are both devoid of human emotion and repeatable.

23. (Previously submitted) The process according to claim 19 of presenting the results from  
said survey both textually and graphically on a computing output device so that the survey  
originator sees both a summary of their own entity's results for satisfaction and level of  
conviction (the weighted score) as well as the results of a plurality of entities, thereby  
allowing an immediate benchmarking.